arXiv:1211.3429v2 [math.NT] 1 Dec 2012

REGULAR FILTERED (ϕ, N)-MODULES OF DIMENSION 3

CHOL PARK

ABSTRACT. We classify 3-dimensional semi-stable representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with coefficients and regular Hodge–Tate weights, by determining the isomorphism classes of admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ with $0 < r < s$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let p be a prime number, and write $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ for the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$. In this paper, we classify 3-dimensional semi-stable representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with coefficients and with regular Hodge–Tate weights. By a theorem of Colmez and Fontaine [6], this is equivalent to determining the isomorphism classes of admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ with $0 < r < s$, and that is what we do.

Let us explain our motivation for doing this. This work is the first part of the author's Ph.D. thesis in which we construct deformation spaces whose characteristic 0 closed points are the semi-stable lifts with Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1, 2)$ of a fixed irreducible representation $\overline{\rho} : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \to \mathrm{GL}_3(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$. The existence of these deformation spaces was proved by Kisin [11], and their geometry plays an essential role in the Taylor–Wiles–Kisin method [16, 15, 13] for proving the modularity of Galois representations. In particular, the special fibers of these deformation spaces are described by a conjecture of Breuil–Mézard [2] as well as a refinement of this conjecture due to Emerton–Gee [7]. The $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ case of the Breuil–Mézard conjecture is a theorem of Kisin [12], and implies the Fontaine–Mazur conjecture for $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})$.

Our goal is to address certain special cases of the Breuil–Mézard conjecture for $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ — namely, the semi-stable case with Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1, 2)$, with irreducible $\overline{\rho}$ — following the method of [14]. The plan, roughly speaking, is to classify lattices in semi-stable representations $\rho : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \to \mathrm{GL}_3(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$ with Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1, 2)$, by classifying the corresponding strongly divisible modules [1] (these are certain integral structures closely related to filtered (ϕ, N)-modules). The first step is to classify the semi-stable representations ρ with these Hodge–Tate weights, and that is what is done in this paper. In fact, since it will add relatively little extra work, we consider the case of distinct Hodge–Tate weights $0 < r < s$, rather than simply the case $(0, 1, 2)$.

We find 49 families of admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of dimension 3 for general r and s with $0 < r < s$. Among them, there are 26 families with $N = 0$ (i.e., the crystalline case; see Subsection 2.7), there are 20 families with rank $N = 1$ (see Subsection 3.6), and there are 3 families with rank $N = 2$ (see Subsection 4.2). This is in contrast to the GL_2 setting, where there are only three families with $N = 0$ and one with rank $N = 1$. We also determine which of these admissible filtered

(ϕ, N)-modules correspond to irreducible representations; in fact, we determine all submodules of these admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules.

We note the following mild hypothesis. Let $E/\mathbb{Q}_p$ be a finite extension. What we actually do is classify the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with E-coefficients, corresponding to representations $\rho : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \to \mathrm{GL}_3(E)$, under the hypothesis that the Jordan form of the Frobenius map ϕ is defined over E. Since the correspondence between Galois representations and filtered (ϕ, N)-modules is compatible with extension of coefficients, this assumption is harmless.

Dousmanis [5] has independently treated the case of 3-dimensional Frobenius-semisimple semi-stable representations of G_K with $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$ unramified. Related problems in the case of 2-dimensional representations have been treated in several articles. Savitt [14] classifies the potentially crystalline 2-dimensional representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with tamely ramified Galois type. This is extended to all potentially semi-stable representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ by Ghate and Mézard [10] at least in the case when p is odd, and to potentially semi-stable representations of G_K for $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$ finite by Dousmanis [4].

This paper is organized as follows. In the remainder of the introduction we give a brief review of p-adic Hodge theory, and introduce notation that will be used throughout the paper. In Section 2, we collect the admissible filtered ϕ-modules for each Jordan form of ϕ, and list the isomorphism classes with $N = 0$ in Subsection 2.7. In Section 3, we first find the possible types of ϕ satisfying $N\phi = p\phi N$ under the assumption that N has rank 1. We then collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules for each type of ϕ, and list the isomorphism classes with $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$ in Subsection 3.6. The case $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$ is treated in Section 4, following the same method as in Section 3. There is only one type of ϕ satisfying $N\phi = p\phi N$ in this case and we list the isomorphism classes with $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$ in Subsection 4.2.

1.1. **Review of filtered (ϕ, N)-modules.** Let K and E be finite extensions of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ inside $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ and K_0 the maximal absolutely unramified subextension of K. We write σ for the absolute Frobenius element on K_0, and $G_K = \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/K)$ for the absolute Galois group of K. Fix a uniformizer π_K for K, thereby fixing the inclusion

$$K \otimes_{K_0} \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{st}} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{dR}},$$

where $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{st}}, \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{dR}}$ are rings of p-adic periods defined in [8]. Let v_p be a valuation on $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ with $v_p(p) = 1$.

A *filtered* (ϕ, N)*-module* (strictly speaking, a filtered (ϕ, N, K, E)-module) of rank d is a free $(K_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} E)$-module D of rank d together with a triple $(\phi, N, \{\mathrm{Fil}^i D_K\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$ where

- the *Frobenius map* ϕ is a σ-semilinear and E-linear automorphism,
- the *monodromy operator* N is a (nilpotent) $K_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} E$-linear endomorphism such that $N\phi = p\phi N$, and
- the *Hodge filtration* $\{\mathrm{Fil}^i D_K\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a decreasing filtration on $D_K := K \otimes_{K_0} D$ such that a $(K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} E)$-module $\mathrm{Fil}^i D_K$ is D_K if $i \ll 0$ and 0 if $i \gg 0$.

A *filtered* ϕ*-module* is a filtered (ϕ, N)-module with trivial monodromy operator N. A *morphism of filtered* (ϕ, N)*-modules*

$$\eta : D = (\phi, N, \{\mathrm{Fil}^i D_K\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) \longrightarrow D' = (\phi', N', \{\mathrm{Fil}^i D'_K\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$$

is a $(K_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} E)$-module homomorphism such that

- $\phi' \circ \eta = \eta \circ \phi$,

- $N' \circ \eta = \eta \circ N$, and
- the induced map $\eta_K : D_K \to D'_K$ satisfies $\eta_K(\mathrm{Fil}^i D_K) \subset \eta_K(\mathrm{Fil}^i D'_K)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The Hodge–Tate weights of a filtered (ϕ, N)-module D are the integers r such that $\mathrm{Fil}^r D_K \neq \mathrm{Fil}^{r+1} D_K$, each counted with multiplicity

$$\dim_E(\mathrm{Fil}^r D_K / \mathrm{Fil}^{r+1} D_K).$$

If the rank of D over $K_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} E$ is d, then there are precisely $d \cdot [K : \mathbb{Q}_p]$ Hodge–Tate weights, with multiplicity. If $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$ and the Hodge–Tate weights are $r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_d$, we say that the filtered (ϕ, N)-module D is of *Hodge type* $(r_1, ..., r_d)$. When the Hodge–Tate weights of D are distinct, we say that D is *regular* (or that it has regular Hodge–Tate weights).

If D is a filtered (ϕ, N)-module of dimension n as a K_0-vector space, then we give $\otimes^n_{K_0} D$ the structure of a filtered (ϕ, N)-module by setting

- $\phi = \otimes^n \phi$,
- $N = N \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes N \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 + \cdots + 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \otimes N$, and
- $\mathrm{Fil}^i(K \otimes_{K_0} (\otimes^n_{K_0} D)) = \sum\limits_{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_n=i} \mathrm{Fil}^{i_1} D_K \otimes_K ... \otimes_K \mathrm{Fil}^{i_n} D_K$.

Taking the image structure on $\wedge^n_{K_0} D$ makes $\wedge^n_{K_0} D$ into a filtered (ϕ, N)-module as well. Since $\dim_{K_0} \wedge^n_{K_0} D = 1$, we define

$$\mathrm{t}_H(D) = \frac{\max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \,|\, \mathrm{Fil}^i(K \otimes_{K_0} (\wedge^n_{K_0} D)) \neq 0\}}{[E : \mathbb{Q}_p]} \text{ and } \mathrm{t}_N(D) = \frac{v_p(\phi(x)/x)}{[E : \mathbb{Q}_p]}$$

for a nonzero element x in $\wedge^n_{K_0} D$. (Our definitions of the Hodge invariant t_H and Newton invariant t_N are normalized differently from those in [6] because we divide by $[E : \mathbb{Q}_p]$, but of course will still give the same notion of admissibility below.)

A $(K_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} E)$-submodule D' of a filtered (ϕ, N)-module D is a *filtered* (ϕ, N)-*submodule* if it is ϕ-invariant and N-invariant, in which case D' has a Frobenius map $\phi|_{D'}$, a monodromy operator $N|_{D'}$, and the filtration $\mathrm{Fil}^i D'_K = \mathrm{Fil}^i D_K \cap D'_K$. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module D is said to be *admissible* if $\mathrm{t}_H(D) = \mathrm{t}_N(D)$, and if $\mathrm{t}_H(D') \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D')$ for each filtered (ϕ, N)-submodule D' of D.

Let V be a finite-dimensional E-vector space equipped with continuous action of G_K, and define

$$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{st}}(V) := (\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{st}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} V)^{G_K}.$$

Then $\mathrm{rank}_{K_0 \otimes E} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{st}}(V) \leq \dim_E V$. If equality holds, then we say that V is *semi-stable*; in that case $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{st}}(V)$ inherits from B_{st} the structure of an admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-module. (See [8] for details.) We say that V is *crystalline* if V is semi-stable and the monodromy operator N on $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{st}}(V)$ is 0.

If V is semi-stable, then when we refer to the Hodge–Tate weights or the Hodge type of V, we mean those of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{st}}(V)$. Our normalizations imply that the cyclotomic character $\varepsilon : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \to E^\times$ has Hodge–Tate weight -1. Twisting V by a power ε^n of the cyclotomic character has the effect of shifting all the Hodge–Tate weights of V by $-n$; after a suitable twist, we are therefore free to assume that the lowest weight of V is 0.

1.2. **Notation and Terminology.** If D is an admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-module with Hodge–Tate weights $0 < r < s$ corresponding to a representation of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, we will write

$$\mathrm{Fil}^i D = \begin{cases} D, & \text{if } i \leq 0; \\ L_2, & \text{if } 0 < i \leq r; \\ L_1, & \text{if } r < i \leq s; \\ 0, & \text{if } s < i, \end{cases}$$

where $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$ is an E-vector space with basis e_1, e_2, e_3 and L_j is a subspace of D of dimension j for $j = 1, 2$. We assume that E is large enough so that the Jordan form of ϕ is well-defined over E. We let $[T]$ be the matrix presentation of an endomorphism T on D with respect to e_1, e_2, e_3 and $\mathbb{P}^1(E)$ the E-rational points in the projective line. In this paper, we say that a representation is *non-split reducible* if it is reducible but indecomposable, and that a representation is *irreducible* means that it is absolutely irreducible.

1.3. **Acknowledgments.** The author thanks his advisor, David Savitt, for his encouragement, guidance, and numerous helpful comments and suggestions. The author also thanks Matthew Emerton for his helpful comments and suggestions.

This work was completed while the author was a visiting student at Northwestern University during the 2011-12 academic year, and the author is grateful to the mathematics department at Northwestern for its hospitality.

2. Admissible filtered ϕ-modules

In this section, we classify the admissible filtered ϕ-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ for $0 < r < s$. At the first six subsections, we collect such modules for each Jordan form of ϕ, and, at the last subsection, we classify them and list the isomorphism classes of admissible filtered ϕ-modules.

2.1. **The first case of $N = 0$.** Assume that ϕ has a minimal polynomial of the form $(x - \lambda)$. So $\phi = \lambda I$, where $\lambda \in E^\times$ and I is the 3×3-identity matrix. By admissibility, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$. It is clear that every subspace in D is ϕ-invariant. In particular, L_1 is ϕ-invariant. So, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$. But $s > \frac{r+s}{3}$. Hence, there are no admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.2. **The second case of $N = 0$.** Assume that ϕ has a minimal polynomial of the form $(x - \lambda)^2$. So we may assume that $\phi e_1 = \lambda e_1 + e_2$, $\phi e_2 = \lambda e_2$, and $\phi e_3 = \lambda e_3$. By admissibility, we have

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}.$$

Lemma 2.1. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ if and only if P is a matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2}$ and $P_{1,2} = P_{1,3} = P_{3,2} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $P = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ g & h & i \end{pmatrix}$. We compute the matrix products:

$$P[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a + b & \lambda b & \lambda c \\ \lambda d + e & \lambda e & \lambda f \\ \lambda g + h & \lambda h & \lambda i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [\phi]P = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a & \lambda b & \lambda c \\ a + \lambda d & b + \lambda e & c + \lambda f \\ \lambda g & \lambda h & \lambda i \end{pmatrix}.$$

By comparing the entries we get the result. □

Lemma 2.2. (1) *Every 1-dimensional subspace in $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ is the only ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 1.*

(2) *A two dimensional subspace of $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ is ϕ-invariant if and only if it contains e_2.*

Proof. The case (1) is clear since the ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 1 are the eigenspaces. Let D_2 be a ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 2. If $e_2 \notin D_2$, then there exists an element $e_1+be_2+ce_3$ in D_2. Then $\phi(e_1+be_2+ce_3) = \lambda(e_1+be_2+ce_3)+e_2$, and so $e_2 \in D_2$, which is a contradiction. The converse is clear. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.2.1. Assume first that L_1 is ϕ-invariant. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$.

2.2.2. If L_2 is ϕ-invariant, then, by admissibility, $r+s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$.

2.2.3. Finally, assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant. We let D_1, D_2 be ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 1 and of dimension 2, respectively. Then, by admissibility, for D_1 with $D_1 \subset L_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)(s \geq 2r)$, for D_1 with $D_1 \not\subseteq L_2$ $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, for D_2 with $D_2 \cap L_2 = L_1$ $s = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)(s \leq 2r)$, and for D_2 with $L_1 \not\subseteq D_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)$. So admissible filtered ϕ-modules occur in this case if and only if $s = 2r$, and the corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $L_2 \cap E(e_2, e_3)$ and D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$.

2.3. **The third case of $N = 0$.** Assume that ϕ has a minimal polynomial of the form $(x-\lambda)^3$. So we may assume that $\phi e_1 = \lambda e_1 + e_2$, $\phi e_2 = \lambda e_2 + e_3$, and $\phi e_3 = \lambda e_3$. By admissibility, we have

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ if and only if P is a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2} = P_{3,3}$ and $P_{2,1} = P_{3,2}$.*

Proof. Let P be as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. We compute the matrix products:

$$P[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a + b & \lambda b + c & \lambda c \\ \lambda d + e & \lambda e + f & \lambda f \\ \lambda g + h & \lambda h + i & \lambda i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [\phi]P = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a & \lambda b & \lambda c \\ a + \lambda d & b + \lambda e & c + \lambda f \\ d + \lambda g & e + \lambda h & f + \lambda i \end{pmatrix}.$$

By comparing the entries we get the result. □

Lemma 2.4. *$E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ are the only nontrivial and proper ϕ-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. The vector subspaces listed above are obviously ϕ-invariant. Obviously Ee_3 is the only ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 1. Let D_2 be a ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 2 with $D_2 \neq E(e_2, e_3)$. Then there exists an element $e_1 + be_2 + ce_3$ in D, and $\phi(e_1 + be_2 + ce_3) = \lambda(e_1 + be_2 + ce_3) + e_2 + be_3$. So $e_2 + be_3 \in D_2$, and $\phi(e_2 + be_3) = \lambda(e_2 + be_3) + e_3$. Hence, $e_3 \in D_2$, i.e., D_2 has three linearly independent vectors, which is contradiction. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.3.1. Assume first that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$.

2.3.2. If $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$, then, by admissibility, $r+s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$.

2.3.3. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $L_2 \cap E(e_2, e_3) = Ee_3$ and $L_1 \nsubseteq E(e_2, e_3)$. By admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ $(s \geq 2r)$ and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$. So admissible filtered ϕ-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \geq 2r$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $s = 2r$ and irreducible if $s > 2r$.

2.3.4. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $L_2 \cap E(e_2, e_3) = L_1$ and $e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$ $(s \leq 2r)$. So admissible filtered ϕ-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \leq 2r$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $s = 2r$ and irreducible if $s < 2r$.

2.3.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $e_3 \notin \text{Ł}_2$, and $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$. So admissible filtered ϕ-modules always occur in this case and the corresponding representations are irreducible.

2.4. **The fourth case of $N = 0$.** Assume that ϕ has a minimal polynomial of the form $(x - \lambda)(x - \lambda_3)$ and a characteristic polynomial of the form $(x - \lambda)^2(x - \lambda_3)$ with $\lambda \neq \lambda_3$. So we may assume that $\phi e_1 = \lambda e_1$, $\phi e_2 = \lambda e_2$, and $\phi e_3 = \lambda_3 e_3$. By admissibility, we have

$$2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s.$$

Lemma 2.5. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ if and only if P is a matrix with $P_{1,3} = P_{2,3} = P_{3,1} = P_{3,2} = 0$.*

Proof. Let P be as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. We compute the matrix products:

$$P[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a & \lambda b & \lambda_3 c \\ \lambda d & \lambda e & \lambda_3 f \\ \lambda g & \lambda h & \lambda_3 i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [\phi]P = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a & \lambda b & \lambda c \\ \lambda d & \lambda e & \lambda f \\ \lambda_3 g & \lambda_3 h & \lambda_3 i \end{pmatrix}.$$

By comparing the entries we get the result. □

Lemma 2.6. (1) *Every 1-dimensional subspace of $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ and $E\mathrm{e}_3$ are the only ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 1.*
(2) *For any $(a, b) \in E^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ $E(a\mathrm{e}_1 + b\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ are the only ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 2.*

Proof. The vector subspaces listed above are obviously ϕ-invariant. The case (1) is clear since every ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 1 is the eigenspaces. Let D_2 be a ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 2. For the case (2), assume that $e_3 \notin D_2$ and $D_2 \neq E(e_1, e_2)$. Then $ae_1 + be_2 + e_3 \in D_2$, and $\phi(ae_1 + be_2 + e_3) = \lambda(ae_1 + be_2 + e_3) + (\lambda_3 - \lambda)e_3$. Hence, $e_3 \in D_2$, which is contradiction. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.4.1. Assume first that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then L_2 is ϕ-invariant. So, by admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$ and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

2.4.2. Assume that $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_2)$. Then L_1 is ϕ-invariant. So, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $0 \leq \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

2.4.3. Assume that L_1 is not ϕ-invariant, but L_2 is. Then $L_2 \neq E(e_1, e_2)$. So, by admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$ and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2 \cap E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2 \cap E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

2.4.4. Assume finally that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_1, e_2)$ and $e_3 \notin L_2$. Let D_1, D_2 be ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 1 and of dimension 2, respectively. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, for D_1 with $D_1 \subset L_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, for D_1 with $D_1 \not\subset L_2$ and $D_1 \neq Ee_3$ $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, for D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$ $s = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, for D_2 with $L_1 \not\subset D_2$ and $e_3 \in D_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda) = r$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = s - r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case. The submodules are $L_2 \cap E(e_1, e_2)$ and D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$. Hence, the corresponding representations are decomposable.

2.5. **The fifth case of $N = 0$.** Assume that ϕ has a minimal polynomial $(x - \lambda)^2(x - \lambda_3)$ with $\lambda \neq \lambda_3$. So we may assume that $\phi e_1 = \lambda e_1 + e_2$, $\phi e_2 = \lambda e_2$, and $\phi e_3 = \lambda_3 e_3$. By admissibility, we have

$$2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s.$$

Lemma 2.7. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ if and only if P is a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2}$ and $P_{3,1} = 0 = P_{3,2}$.*

Proof. Let P be as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Then we compute the matrix products:

$$P[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a + b & \lambda b & \lambda_3 c \\ \lambda d + e & \lambda e & \lambda_3 f \\ \lambda g + h & \lambda h & \lambda_3 i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [\phi]P = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a & \lambda b & \lambda c \\ a + \lambda d & b + \lambda e & c + \lambda f \\ \lambda_3 g & \lambda_3 h & \lambda_3 i \end{pmatrix}.$$

By comparing the entries, we get the result. □

Lemma 2.8. *Ee_2, Ee_3, $E(e_1, e_2)$, and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are the only nontrivial and proper ϕ-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. The vector subspaces listed above are obviously ϕ-invariant. Obviously Ee_2, Ee_3 are the only ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 1 since they are the eigenspaces. Let D_2 be a ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 2. Assume that D_2 is not a subspace listed above. Then there is an element $ae_1 + be_2 + e_3 \in D_2$ with $a \neq 0$, and $\phi(ae_1 + be_2 + e_3) = \lambda(ae_1 + be_2 + e_3) + ae_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda)e_3$. Thus $ae_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda)e_3 \in D_2$ and $\phi(ae_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda)e_3) = \lambda(ae_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda)e_3) + (\lambda_3 - \lambda)^2 e_3$. Hence, $e_3 \in D_2$ and so D_2 is of dimension 3, which is contradiction. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.5.1. Assume first that $L_1 = Ee_2$. By admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $0 \leq \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

2.5.2. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$ and $L_2 \neq E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $e_2 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $E(e_1, e_2)$ and Ee_3.

2.5.3. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$. By admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$ and $r \leq \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

2.5.4. Assume that L_1 is not ϕ-invariant and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_2)$. By admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $E(e_1, e_2)$ and Ee_3.

2.5.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_2)$, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_3 and $E(e_1, e_2)$. So the corresponding representations are decomposable.

2.5.6. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_2)$, and $e_3 \notin L_2$. Then $e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $\frac{s}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s}{2}$, non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$, and irreducible if $\frac{s}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s}{2}$.

2.5.7. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $\frac{r}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq r$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$, non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = r$, and irreducible if $\frac{r}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < r$.

2.5.8. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ-invariant subspace, and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $r \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered φ-modules. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule Ee_2 if $v_p(\lambda) = r$, non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$, and irreducible if $r < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s}{2}$.

2.5.9. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ-invariant subspace, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $\frac{r}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$, non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s}{2}$, and irreducible if $\frac{r}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{s}{2}$.

2.5.10. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ-invariant subspace, and $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $\frac{r}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$, non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$, and irreducible if $\frac{r}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s}{2}$.

2.6. **The sixth case of $N = 0$.** Assume that ϕ has a minimal polynomial of the form $(x - \lambda_1)(x - \lambda_2)(x - \lambda_3)$ with distinct λ_i. So we may assume that $\phi e_1 = \lambda_1 e_1$, $\phi e_2 = \lambda_2 e_2$, and $\phi e_3 = \lambda_3 e_3$. By admissibility, we have

$$v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3).$$

Lemma 2.9. *Let $[\phi] = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3]$ and $[\phi'] = [\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3]$ be the diagonal matrices. Then, for a 3×3-matrix P, $P[\phi] = [\phi']P$ if and only if*

$$P = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3; \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1; \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2; \\ \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & y \\ 0 & z & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2; \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & z \\ 0 & y & 0 \\ x & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1; \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y & 0 \\ x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let P be as in the proof of the Lemma 2.1. Then we compute the matrix products:

$$P[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 a & \lambda_2 b & \lambda_3 c \\ \lambda_1 d & \lambda_2 e & \lambda_3 f \\ \lambda_1 g & \lambda_2 h & \lambda_3 i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [\phi']P = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda'_1 a & \lambda'_1 b & \lambda'_1 c \\ \lambda'_2 d & \lambda'_2 e & \lambda'_2 f \\ \lambda'_3 g & \lambda'_3 h & \lambda'_3 i \end{pmatrix}.$$

By comparing the entries for each case, we get the results. □

Lemma 2.10. *$E\mathrm{e}_1$, $E\mathrm{e}_2$, $E\mathrm{e}_3$, $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$, $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$, and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ are the only nontrivial and proper ϕ-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. The vector subspaces listed above are obviously ϕ-invariant. For the dimension 1, it is clear since every ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 1 is the eigenspace. Let D_2 be a ϕ-invariant subspace of dimension 2 that are not listed above. Then there is an element $a\lambda_1 + b\lambda_2 + c\lambda_3$ in D_2 with $abc \neq 0$ and $\phi(a\lambda_1 + b\lambda_2 + c\lambda_3) = \lambda_1(a\lambda_1 + b\lambda_2 + c\lambda_3) + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)be_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)ce_3$. So $(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)be_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)ce_3 \in D_2$ and $\phi((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)be_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)ce_3) = \lambda_2((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)be_2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)ce_3) + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)ce_3$. Hence, $e_3 \in D_2$, i.e., D_2 is of dimension 3, which is contradiction. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.6.1. Assume first that $L_1 = Ee_1$ and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_2)$. By admissibility, we have $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$, $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$, and $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case. The corresponding representations are obviously decomposable.

2.6.2. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_1$ and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_3)$. By the same argument as above, we have $v_p(\lambda_1) = s, v_p(\lambda_2) = 0, v_p(\lambda_3) = r$ which contradict to the assumption $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$. Similarly, if L_1 is a ϕ-invariant subspace other than Ee_1 and if L_2 is a ϕ-invariant subspace, it violates the assumption $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$.

2.6.3. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_1$ and L_2 is not ϕ-invariant. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $s = v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case. The corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules Ee_1 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ in this case; moreover, if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$ then Ee_3 and $E(e_1, e_3)$ are also submodules.

2.6.4. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_2$ and L_2 is not φ-invariant. Then $e_1, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So we get $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq s$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, which violates $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$. Hence, there are no admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.6.5. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$ and L_2 is not φ-invariant. Then $e_1, e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So we get $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq s$, which violates $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$. Hence, there are no admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case.

2.6.6. Assume that L_1 is not ϕ-invariant and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_2)$. By admissibility, we have $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq r$, $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules in this case. The corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules Ee_3 and $E(e_1, e_2)$; moreover, if $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$ then Ee_2 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are also submodules.

2.6.7. Assume that L_1 is not ϕ-invariant and $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$. By admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_3)$. So we get $v_p(\lambda_1) = 0$, and $v_p(\lambda_2)+v_p(\lambda_3) = r+s$, which violates the assumption $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$.

2.6.8. Assume that L_1 is not ϕ-invariant and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_3)$. By admissibility, we have $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So we get $v_p(\lambda_2) = 0$, $v_p(\lambda_3) \geq r$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, which violates the assumption $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$.

2.6.9. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_2)$, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $e_1, e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) = r$, $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) = s$, and $s \geq 2r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules Ee_3 and $E(e_1, e_2)$.

2.6.10. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_2)$, and $e_3 \notin L_2$. Then $e_1, e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $s \geq v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, $v_p(\lambda_3) \leq r$, and $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)+v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, $E(e_1, e_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda_3) = r$, and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $s > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) < r$.

2.6.11. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$, and $e_1 \in L_2$. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $r = v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$, $v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = s$, and $s \leq 2r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules Ee_1 and $E(e_2, e_3)$.

2.6.12. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$, and $e_1 \notin L_2$. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $r \geq v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$, $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, and $s \leq 2r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are $E(e_2, e_3)$

if $v_p(\lambda_1) = r$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $r > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$ and $s \leq 2r - 1$.

2.6.13. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_3)$, and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $e_1, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) = r \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3) = s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_2 and $E(e_1, e_3)$. Moreover, Ee_3 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are also submodules if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$. So the corresponding representations are decomposable.

2.6.14. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_3)$, and $e_2 \notin L_2$. Then $e_1, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $s \geq v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$, $v_p(\lambda_2) \leq r$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$, $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$, and Ee_3, $E(e_2, e_3)$, $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $s > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) < r$.

2.6.15. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ-invariant subspace, and $e_1 \in L_2$. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, $r \leq v_p(\lambda_1) \leq s$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, Ee_1 if $v_p(\lambda_1) = r$, and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$ and $r < v_p(\lambda_1) < s$.

2.6.16. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ-invariant subspace, and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $e_1, e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, $r \leq v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, Ee_2 if $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$, $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) > r$.

2.6.17. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any φ-invariant subspace, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $e_1, e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq$

$\mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq r$, $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, and $s \geq 2r$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda_3) = r$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > r$ and $s \geq 2r + 1$.

2.6.18. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ-invariant subspace, and $e_1, e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$. Then, by admissibility, we have $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_1) = v_p(\lambda_1)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda_3)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_2)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_2)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_3)$. So, for $s \geq v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, we have admissible filtered ϕ-modules. The submodules are Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$ and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$. Hence, we have the irreducible admissible filtered ϕ-modules if $s > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$.

2.7. **List of the isomorphism classes with $N = 0$.** In the previous subsections, we found all of the admissible filtered ϕ-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ for $0 < r < s$. In this subsection, we classify the isomorphism classes of the admissible filtered ϕ-modules on $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$.

The following example arises from 2.2.3.

Example 2.11. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^1_{cris} = D^1_{cris}(\lambda);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \in E$.
- $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$ and $s = 2r$.

Proposition 2.12. (1) *D^1_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*
(2) *The corresponding representations to D^1_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ and $E\mathrm{e}_3$.*
(3) *$D^1_{cris}(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to $D^1_{cris}(\lambda')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$.*

Proof. From 2.2.3, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + be_2 + ce_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + be_2 + ce_3, de_2 + e_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 + (cd - b)e_2 - ce_3$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto -de_2 + e_3$, we get $D^1_{cris}(\lambda)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.1. So now part (1) and (2) are clear. Part (3) is clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.3.3.

Example 2.13. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^2_{cris} = D^2_{cris}(\lambda);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \in E$.
- $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$ and $s \geq 2r$.

Proposition 2.14. (1) *D^2_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* D^2_{cris} *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_3$ *if* $s = 2r$ *and*
  - *irreducible if* $s > 2r$.

(3) $D^2_{cris}(\lambda)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^2_{cris}(\lambda')$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$.

Proof. From 2.3.3, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2 + (a^2 - b)e_3$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - ae_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^2_{cris}(\lambda)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.3. So now part (1) and (2) are clear. Part (3) is clear, since any isomorphism reserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.3.4.

Example 2.15. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^3_{cris} = D^3_{cris}(\lambda);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_2$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \in E$.
- $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$ and $s \leq 2r$.

Proposition 2.16. (1) D^3_{cris} *represents admissible filtered* ϕ*-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* D^3_{cris} *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $s = 2r$ *and*
  - *irreducible if* $s < 2r$.

(3) $D^3_{cris}(\lambda)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^3_{cris}(\lambda')$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$.

Proof. From 2.3.4, if we let $L_1 = E(e_2 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_2 + ae_3, e_1 + be_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2 - be_3$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - ae_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^3_{cris}(\lambda)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.3. So now part (1) and (2) are clear. Part (3) is clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.3.5.

Example 2.17. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^4_{cris} = D^4_{cris}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \in E$.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$ and $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{3}$.

Proposition 2.18. (1) D^4_{cris} *represents admissible filtered* ϕ*-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* D^4_{cris} *are irreducible.*

(3) $D^4_{cris}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ *is isomorphic to* $D^4_{cris}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$ *and* $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.

Proof. From 2.3.5, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2 + ce_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2 + (a^2 - b)e_3$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - ae_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^4_{cris}(\lambda)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.3. So now part (1) and (2) are clear. Since any isomorphism preserves the filtration and the eigenvalues of ϕ, Lemma 2.3 implies that an automorphism of D^4_{cris} is a scalar multiple of the identity map, which completes part (3). ☐

The following example arises from 2.4.4.

Example 2.19. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^5_{cris} = D^5_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_3, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $v_p(\lambda) = r$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = s - r$.

Proposition 2.20. (1) *D^5_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^5_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_2$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$.*

(3) *$D^5_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^5_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.4.4, if we let $L_1 = E(ae_1+be_2+e_3)$ and $L_2 = (ae_1+be_2+e_3, ce_1+de_2)$ with $ad - bc \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $ae_1 + be_2 \mapsto e_1$, $ce_1 + de_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^5_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.5. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. ☐

The following example arises from 2.5.2.

Example 2.21. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^6_{cris} = D^6_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_3$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = s$.

Proposition 2.22. (1) *D^6_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^6_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$.*

(3) *$D^6_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^6_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.2, if we let $L_1 = Ee_3$ and $L_2 = (e_3, e_1 + ae_2)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^6_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. ☐

The following example arises from 2.5.4.

Example 2.23. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^7_{cris} = D^7_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.

- $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$.

Proposition 2.24. (1) *D^7_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*
(2) *The corresponding representations to D^7_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$.*
(3) *$D^7_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^7_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.4, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2, e_2)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^7_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.5.5.

Example 2.25. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^8_{cris} = D^8_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_3) = r$.

Proposition 2.26. (1) *D^8_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*
(2) *The corresponding representations to D^8_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$.*
(3) *$D^8_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^8_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.5, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2, e_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^8_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.5.6.

Example 2.27. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^9_{cris} = D^9_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2 + e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $\frac{s}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.28. (1) *D^9_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*
(2) *The corresponding representations to D^9_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s}{2}$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$, and*
  - *irreducible if $\frac{s}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s}{2}$.*

(3) *$D^9_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^9_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.6, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2, e_2 + ce_3)$ with $c \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $ce_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^9_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.5.7.

Example 2.29. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{10}_{cris} = D^{10}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_2 + e_3, e_1)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_2 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $\frac{r}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq r$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.30. (1) *D^{10}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{10}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = r$, and*
  - *irreducible if $\frac{r}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < r$.*

(3) *$D^{10}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{10}_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.7, if we let $L_1 = E(e_2 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_2 + ae_3, e_1 + be_3)$ with $a \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 + \frac{b}{a}e_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $ae_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{10}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.5.8.

Example 2.31. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{11}_{cris} = D^{11}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_3, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $r \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.32. (1) *D^{11}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{11}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_2$ if $v_p(\lambda) = r$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$, and*
  - *irreducible if $r < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s}{2}$.*

(3) *$D^{11}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{11}_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.8, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2)$ with $b \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $be_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{11}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.5.9.

Example 2.33. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{12}_{cris} = D^{12}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $\frac{r}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{s}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.34. (1) *D^{12}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{12}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s}{2}$, and*
  - *irreducible if $\frac{r}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{s}{2}$.*

(3) *$D^{12}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{12}_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$.*

Proof. From 2.5.9, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_3)$ with $b \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $be_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{12}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. The part (3) is also clear, since any isomorphism preserves the eigenvalues of ϕ. □

The following example arises from 2.5.10.

Example 2.35. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{13}_{cris} = D^{13}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_3, e_2 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_3 \in E$.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E^\times$, $\frac{r}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s}{2}$, and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.36. (1) *D^{13}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{13}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r}{2}$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s}{2}$, and*
  - *irreducible if $\frac{r}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s}{2}$.*

(3) *$D^{13}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^{13}_{cris}(\lambda', \lambda'_3, \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$, and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 2.5.10, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2 + ce_3)$ with $bc \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $be_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{13}_{cris}(\lambda, \lambda_3)$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 2.7. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since an isomorphism preserves the filtration and the eigenvalues of ϕ, Lemma 2.7 implies that such an isomorphism should be a scalar multiple of the identity map, which completes the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.1.

Example 2.37. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{14}_{cris} = D^{14}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$, $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$, and $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$.

Proposition 2.38. (1) *D^{14}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *Every ϕ-invariant subspace is a submodule of D^{14}_{cris} and so the corresponding representations to D^{14}_{cris} are decomposable.*

(3) *$D^{14}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{14}_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$*

Proof. From 2.6.1, the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every morphism should preserve the filtration, Lemma 2.9 implies that the only isomorphisms are scalar multiple of the identity map, which completes the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.3.

Example 2.39. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{15}_{cris} = D^{15}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2 + e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_1$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $s = v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r$.

Proposition 2.40. (1) *D^{15}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{15}_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_1$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$; moreover, if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$, then $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ are also submodules.*

(3) *$D^{15}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{15}_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3)$ if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3, & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.3, if we let $L_1 = Ee_1$ and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_2 + ae_3)$ with $a \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $ae_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get D^{15}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it should fix e_1 but it can either fix or swap e_2 and e_3 by lemma 2.9. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.6.

Example 2.41. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{16}_{cris} = D^{16}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_2)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq r, v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.42. *(1) D^{16}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) The corresponding representations to D^{16}_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_2)$; moreover, if $v_p(\lambda_2)=r$, then $E\mathrm{e}_2$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$ are also submodules.

(3) $D^{16}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{16}_{cris}(\lambda'_1,\lambda'_2,\lambda'_3)$ if and only if either

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1=\lambda'_1, \lambda_2=\lambda'_2, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3, & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1=\lambda'_2, \lambda_2=\lambda'_1, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.6, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_2)$ and $L_2=E(e_1,e_2)$ with $a\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $ae_2\mapsto e_2$, and $e_3\mapsto e_3$, we get D^{16}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it should fix e_3 but it can either fix or swap e_1 and e_2 by lemma 2.9. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.9.

Example 2.43. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{17}_{cris}=D^{17}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D=E(e_1+e_2,e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+e_2)$
- $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)\geq v_p(\lambda_3)=r$, $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)=s$, and $s\geq 2r$.

Proposition 2.44. *(1) D^{17}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) The corresponding representations to D^{17}_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_2)$.

(3) $D^{17}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{17}_{cris}(\lambda'_1,\lambda'_2,\lambda'_3)$ if and only if either

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1=\lambda'_1, \lambda_2=\lambda'_2, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3, & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1=\lambda'_2, \lambda_2=\lambda'_1, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.9, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_2)$ and $L_2=E(e_1+ae_2,e_3)$ with $a\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $ae_2\mapsto e_2$, and $e_3\mapsto e_3$, we get D^{17}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it should fix e_3 but it can either fix or swap e_1 and e_2 by lemma 2.9. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.10.

Example 2.45. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{18}_{cris}=D^{18}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D=E(e_1+e_2,e_2+e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+e_2)$
- $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $s\geq v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)\geq v_p(\lambda_3)\geq 0$, $v_p(\lambda_3)\leq r$, and $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)+v_p(\lambda_3)=r+s$.

Proposition 2.46. *(1) D^{18}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) The corresponding representations to D^{18}_{cris} are

- *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda_3)=0$,*

  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_2)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda_3) = r$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$, *and*
  - *irreducible if* $s > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$ *and* $v_p(\lambda_3) < r$.

(3) $D^{18}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{18}_{cris}(\lambda_1', \lambda_2', \lambda_3')$ *if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \lambda_1', \lambda_2 = \lambda_2', \lambda_3 = \lambda_3', & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda_2', \lambda_2 = \lambda_1', \lambda_3 = \lambda_3'. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.10, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2, e_2 + be_3)$ with $ab \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $ae_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $abe_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get D^{18}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it can either fix or swap e_1 and e_2 to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$, by lemma 2.9. If it swap those two, by sending e_3 to $-e_3$ it can also preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.11.

Example 2.47. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{19}_{cris} = D^{19}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_2 + e_3, e_1)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_2 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $r = v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$, $v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = s$, and $s \leq 2r$.

Proposition 2.48. (1) D^{19}_{cris} *represents admissible filtered* ϕ*-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* D^{19}_{cris} *are decomposable with submodules* $E\mathrm{e}_1$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$.

(3) $D^{19}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{19}_{cris}(\lambda_1', \lambda_2', \lambda_3')$ *if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \lambda_1', \lambda_2 = \lambda_2', \lambda_3 = \lambda_3', & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda_1', \lambda_2 = \lambda_3', \lambda_3 = \lambda_2'. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.11, if we let $L_1 = E(e_2 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_2 + ae_3, e_1)$ with $a \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $ae_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get D^{19}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it can either fix or swap e_2 and e_3, by lemma 2.9. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.12.

Example 2.49. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{20}_{cris} = D^{20}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_2 + e_3, e_1 + e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_2 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $r \geq v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$, $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$, and $s \leq 2r$.

Proposition 2.50. (1) D^{20}_{cris} *represents admissible filtered* ϕ*-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* D^{20}_{cris} *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodules* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda_1) = r$ *and*
  - *irreducible if* $r > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$ *and so* $s \leq 2r - 1$.

(3) *$D^{20}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{20}_{cris}(\lambda_1',\lambda_2',\lambda_3')$ if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1=\lambda_1', \lambda_2=\lambda_2', \lambda_3=\lambda_3', & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1=\lambda_1', \lambda_2=\lambda_3', \lambda_3=\lambda_2'. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.12, if we let $L_1=E(e_2+ae_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_2+ae_3,be_1+e_3)$ with $ab\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $e_2\mapsto abe_2$, and $e_3\mapsto be_3$, we get D^{20}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it can either fix or swap e_2 and e_3 to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$, by lemma 2.9. If it swap e_2 and e_3, it should send e_1 to $-e_1$ to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.13.

Example 2.51. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{21}_{cris}=D^{21}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D=E(e_1+e_3,e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+e_3)$
- $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)=r\geq v_p(\lambda_3)\geq 0$ and $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_3)=s$.

Proposition 2.52. (1) *D^{21}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{21}_{cris} are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_2$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$; moreover, if $v_p(\lambda_1)=s$ then $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$ are also submodules.*

(3) *$D^{21}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{21}_{cris}(\lambda_1',\lambda_2',\lambda_3')$ if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1=\lambda_1', \lambda_2=\lambda_2', \lambda_3=\lambda_3', & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1=\lambda_3', \lambda_2=\lambda_2', \lambda_3=\lambda_1'. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.13, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_1+ae_3,e_2)$ with $a\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $e_2\mapsto e_2$, and $ae_3\mapsto e_3$, we get D^{21}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it can either fix or swap e_1 and e_3, by lemma 2.9. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.14.

Example 2.53. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{22}_{cris}=D^{22}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D=E(e_1+e_3,e_2+e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+e_3)$
- $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $s\geq v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)\geq v_p(\lambda_3)$, $v_p(\lambda_2)\leq r$, and $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)+v_p(\lambda_3)=r+s$.

Proposition 2.54. (1) *D^{22}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{22}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda_3)=0$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_2)=r$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1)=s$, and*

  - *irreducible if* $s > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3)$ *and* $v_p(\lambda_2) < r$.

(3) $D^{22}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{22}_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3)$ *if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3, & \text{or} \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.14, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_3, e_2 + be_3)$ with $ab \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto ae_1$, $e_2 \mapsto be_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get D^{22}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it can either fix or swap e_2 and e_3 to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$, by lemma 2.9. If it swap e_1 and e_3, it should send e_2 to $-e_2$ to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.15.

Example 2.55. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{23}_{cris} = D^{23}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_2 + e_3, e_1)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, $r \leq v_p(\lambda_1) \leq s$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.56. (1) D^{23}_{cris} *represents admissible filtered* ϕ*-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* D^{23}_{cris} *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_3$ *if* $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_1$ *if* $v_p(\lambda_1) = r$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$, *and*
  - *irreducible if* $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$ *and* $r < v_p(\lambda_1) < s$.

(3) $D^{23}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{23}_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3)$ *if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3, & \text{or} \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.15, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_1)$ with $ab \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $ae_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $be_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get D^{23}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it should fix e_1 to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$, by lemma 2.9. To preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$, it can either fix or swap e_2 and e_3. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.16.

Example 2.57. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{24}_{cris} = D^{24}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_2 + e_3, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$
- $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, $v_p(\lambda_2) \geq r$, and $v_p(\lambda_1) + v_p(\lambda_2) + v_p(\lambda_3) = r + s$.

Proposition 2.58. (1) *D^{24}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{24}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda_3)=0$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_2$ if $v_p(\lambda_2)=r$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1)=s$, and*
  - *irreducible if $v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)\geq v_p(\lambda_3)>0$ and $v_p(\lambda_2)>r$.*

(3) *$D^{24}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{24}_{cris}(\lambda'_1,\lambda'_2,\lambda'_3)$ if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1=\lambda'_1, \lambda_2=\lambda'_2, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3, & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1=\lambda'_3, \lambda_2=\lambda'_2, \lambda_3=\lambda'_1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.16, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_2+be_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_1+ae_2+be_3,e_2)$ with $ab\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $ae_2\mapsto e_2$, and $be_3\mapsto e_3$, we get D^{24}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it should fix e_2 to preserve Fil^rD, by lemma 2.9. To preserve Fil^sD, it can either fix or swap e_1 and e_3. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.17.

Example 2.59. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{25}_{cris}=D^{25}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^rD=E(e_1+e_2+e_3,e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^sD=E(e_1+e_2+e_3)$
- $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.
- $v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)\geq v_p(\lambda_3)\geq r$, $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)+v_p(\lambda_3)=r+s$, and $s\geq 2r$.

Proposition 2.60. (1) *D^{25}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{25}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda_3)=r$ and*
  - *irreducible if $v_p(\lambda_1)\geq v_p(\lambda_2)\geq v_p(\lambda_3)>r$ and so $s\geq 2r+1$.*

(3) *$D^{25}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^{25}_{cris}(\lambda'_1,\lambda'_2,\lambda'_3)$ if and only if either*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1=\lambda'_1, \lambda_2=\lambda'_2, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3, & \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1=\lambda'_2, \lambda_2=\lambda'_1, \lambda_3=\lambda'_3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.17, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_2+be_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_1+ae_2+be_3,e_3)$ with $ab\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $ae_2\mapsto e_2$, and $be_3\mapsto e_3$, we get D^{25}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear. Since every isomorphism preserves the filtration, if there is an isomorphism then it should fix e_3 to preserve Fil^rD, by lemma 2.9. To preserve Fil^sD, it can either fix or swap e_1 and e_2. So we get the part (3). □

The following example arises from 2.6.18.

Example 2.61. A filtered ϕ-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{26}_{cris}=D^{26}_{cris}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^rD=E(e_1+e_2+e_3,e_2+\mathfrak{L}e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^sD=E(e_1+e_2+e_3)$
- $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ for distinct λ_i's in E.

- $\mathfrak{L} \in E \setminus \{0,1\}$, $s \geq v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) \geq 0$, and $v_p(\lambda_1)+v_p(\lambda_2)+v_p(\lambda_3) = r+s$.

Proposition 2.62. (1) *D^{26}_{cris} represents admissible filtered ϕ-modules.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to D^{26}_{cris} are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda_3) = 0$,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda_1) = s$, and*
  - *irreducible if $s > v_p(\lambda_1) \geq v_p(\lambda_2) \geq v_p(\lambda_3) > 0$.*

(3) *$D^{26}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^{26}_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3, \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3, \ \textit{and } \mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}', \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1, \ \textit{and } \mathfrak{L}' + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}} = 1, \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2, \ \textit{and } \mathfrak{L} + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}'} = 1, \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2, \ \textit{and } \mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{L}' = 1, \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1, \ \textit{and } \frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}} + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}'} = 1, \quad \textit{or} \\ \lambda_1 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3, \ \textit{and } \mathfrak{L} + \mathfrak{L}' = 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From 2.6.18, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1+ae_2+be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1+ae_2+be_3, ce_2+de_3)$ with $abcd \neq 0$ and $ad-bc \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $ae_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $be_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get D^{25}_{cris}. So now the part (1) and (2) are clear.

By Lemma 2.9, to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$, every isomorphism should be a permutation on the bases modulo scalar multiples. Let T be an isomorphism from $D^{26}_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \mathfrak{L})$ to $D^{26}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3, \mathfrak{L}')$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$, then T sends $e_1 \mapsto e_2, e_2 \mapsto e_3, e_3 \mapsto e_1$ and $T(\mathrm{Fil}^r D) = E(e_1+e_2+e_3, e_2+(1-\frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}})e_3)$, and so we get $\mathfrak{L}'+\frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}} = 1$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$, then T sends $e_1 \mapsto e_3, e_2 \mapsto e_1, e_3 \mapsto e_2$ and $T(\mathrm{Fil}^r D) = E(e_1+e_2+e_3, e_2+\frac{1}{1-\mathfrak{L}}e_3)$, and so we get $\mathfrak{L}+\frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}'} = 1$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$, then T sends $e_1 \mapsto e_1, e_2 \mapsto e_3, e_3 \mapsto e_2$ and $T(\mathrm{Fil}^r D) = E(e_1+e_2+e_3, e_2+\frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}}e_3)$, and so we get $\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{L}' = 1$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_3, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$, then T sends $e_1 \mapsto e_3, e_2 \mapsto e_2, e_3 \mapsto e_1$ and $T(\mathrm{Fil}^r D) = E(e_1+e_2+e_3, e_2+\frac{\mathfrak{L}}{\mathfrak{L}-1}e_3)$, and so we get $\frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}}+\frac{1}{\mathfrak{L}'} = 1$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2, \lambda_2 = \lambda'_1, \lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$, then T sends $e_1 \mapsto e_2, e_2 \mapsto e_1, e_3 \mapsto e_3$ and $T(\mathrm{Fil}^r D) = E(e_1+e_2+e_3, e_2+(1-\mathfrak{L})e_3)$, and so we get $\mathfrak{L}+\mathfrak{L}' = 1$. The converse is also very routine and easy to check. ☐

Proposition 2.63. *Assume that $1 \leq i < j \leq 26$. Then there is an isomorphism from D^i_{cris} to D^j_{cris} if and only if one of the following holds:*

1. $i = 17$, $j = 19$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_3$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,
2. $i = 17$, $j = 19$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,
3. $i = 17$, $j = 21$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$,
4. $i = 17$, $j = 21$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_3$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_1$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$,
5. $i = 19$, $j = 21$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_1$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$,
6. $i = 19$, $j = 21$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,
7. $i = 18$, $j = 20$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,
8. $i = 18$, $j = 22$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$,
9. $i = 20$, $j = 22$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_1$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$,
10. $i = 23$, $j = 24$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_1$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_3$,
11. $i = 23$, $j = 24$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,
12. $i = 23$, $j = 25$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_3$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,
13. $i = 23$, $j = 25$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_3$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_1$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$,
14. $i = 24$, $j = 25$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, *and* $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_2$, *or*

(15) *$i = 24$, $j = 25$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_3$, and $\lambda_3 = \lambda'_1$,*

where $D^i_{cris} = D^i_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ and $D^j_{cris} = D^j_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3)$.

Proof. Since an isomorphism preserves the Jordan forms of the Frobenius map, if D^i_{cris} is isomorphic to D^j_{cris}, then both i and j belong to either $\{1\}$, $[2, 4]$, $\{5\}$, $[6, 13]$, or $[14, 26]$.

If i and j belong to $[2, 4]$, the isomorphism should be of the form in Lemma 2.3. But it is straightforward that such a form can not preserve the filtration if $i \neq j$. Similarly, if i and j belong to $[6, 13]$, then the isomorphism should be of the form in Lemma 2.7, and such a form can not preserve the filtration either if $i \neq j$.

Assume that $D^i_{cris} = D^i_{cris}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^j_{cris} = D^j_{cris}(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3)$ for $i < j$ in $[14, 26]$. Then $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\} = \{\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3\}$. So the question reduces to whether or not there is a matrix of the form in Lemma 2.9 preserving the filtration. Now it is straightforward to check that D^i_{cris} for $i \in \{14, 15, 16, 26\}$ is not isomorphic to any other D^j_{cris} for j in $[14, 26]$. Let $i < j$ in $[17, 25]$. If D^i_{cris} is isomorphic to D^j_{cris}, their filtration should have the same form. So both i and j belong to either $\{17, 19, 21\}$, $\{18, 20, 22\}$, or $\{23, 24, 25\}$.

If there is an isomorphism from D^{17}_{cris} to D^{19}_{cris}, to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$ either $(e_1 \mapsto e_2, e_2 \mapsto e_3)$ or $(e_1 \mapsto e_3, e_2 \mapsto e_2)$. For either case, the isomorphism sends e_3 to e_1 and so it preserves $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$. Hence, we get (1) and (2). The cases (3), (4), (5), and (6) are similar.

If there is an isomorphism from D^{18}_{cris} to D^{20}_{cris}, to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$ either $(e_1 \mapsto e_2, e_2 \mapsto e_3)$ or $(e_1 \mapsto e_3, e_2 \mapsto e_2)$. For either case, the isomorphism sends e_3 to e_1. It is easy to check that $(e_1 \mapsto e_3, e_2 \mapsto e_2, e_3 \mapsto e_1)$ does not preserve the filtration $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$ while $(e_1 \mapsto e_2, e_2 \mapsto e_3, e_3 \mapsto e_1)$ does, so we get (7). The cases (8) and (9) are similar.

If there is an isomorphism from D^{23}_{cris} to D^{24}_{cris}, to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^r D$ the only condition we need is $e_1 \mapsto e_2$ and there are no condition to preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$. So we get (10) and (11). The cases (12), (13), (14), and (15) are similar.

The converse is straightforward. ☐

Proposition 2.64. *Every 3-dimensional crystalline representation of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with regular Hodge–Tate weights is isomorphic to a representation corresponding to some D^i_{cris} up to twist by a power of the cyclotomic character.*

Proof. We found all the admissible filtered ϕ-modules in the previous subsections. Since the list of filtered modules in this subsection represents all we found in the previous subsections, we are done. ☐

3. ADMISSIBLE FILTERED (ϕ, N)-MODULES WITH $\mathrm{rank}\, N = 1$

In this section, we classify the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ for $0 < r < s$ and with the monodromy operator N of rank 1. Assume first that N has rank 1. By choice of a basis for $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$, we may set

$$Ne_1 = e_3 \text{ and } Ne_2 = 0 = Ne_3.$$

From the equation $N\phi = p\phi N$, we should have that

$$\phi e_1 = pxe_1 + ue_2 + ve_3,\ \phi e_2 = ye_2 + we_3, \text{ and } \phi e_3 = xe_3,$$

for some u, v, w, and $x \neq 0 \neq y$. By change of a basis for $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$, we can say a bit more.

Lemma 3.1. *There is an invertible matrix P such that $P[N]P^{-1} = [N]$ and*

$$P[\phi]P^{-1} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} px & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } y = x \text{ and } w = 0; \\ \begin{pmatrix} px & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } y = x \text{ and } w \neq 0; \\ \begin{pmatrix} px & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & px & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } y = px \text{ and } u = 0; \\ \begin{pmatrix} px & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & px & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } y = px \text{ and } u \neq 0; \\ \begin{pmatrix} px & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } px \neq y \neq x. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For each case, use the following matrices for P in order:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{u}{x(1-p)} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{v}{x(1-p)} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{uw}{x(1-p)} & w & 0 \\ \frac{vx(1-p)-uw}{x^2(1-p)^2} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{v}{x(1-p)} & \frac{w}{x(1-p)} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{u^2w+uvx(1-p)}{x^2(1-p)^2} & \frac{uw}{x(1-p)} & u \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{u}{y-px} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{vx-vy+uw}{x(x-y)(1-p)} & \frac{w}{x-y} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Hence, we may assume that $[\phi]$ has one of the forms in the Lemma above. For each type of $[\phi]$, we collect all the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$ in the following subsections.

3.1. **The first case of** $\operatorname{rank} N$**=1.** Assume that

$$[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By admissibility,

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ and $P[N] = [N]P$ if and only if P is a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$ and $P_{2,1} = 0 = P_{3,1}$.*

Proof. The equation $P[N] = [N]P$ forces that P be a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$. Then $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ forces $P_{2,1} = 0 = P_{3,1}$. □

Lemma 3.3. (1) *every 1-dimensional subspace of $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ is the only ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 1.*
(2) *$E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ are the only ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces of dimension 2.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, we know that the ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 1 are Ee_1 and the 1-dimensional subspaces of $E(e_2, e_3)$ and that the ϕ-invariant subspaces of dimension 2 are $E(e_2, e_3)$ and the 2-dimensional subspaces including e_1. Now it is easy to check which ones are N-invariant. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case.

3.1.1. Assume that L_1 is ϕ- and N-invariant. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$.

3.1.2. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_1, e_3)$. Then, by admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$.

3.1.3. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_3)$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Let D_1 be a ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 1. By admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, for D_1 with $D_1 \subset L_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, and for D_1 with $D_1 \not\subset L_2$ $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s = 2r + 1$, but the corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $E(e_2, e_3) \cap L_2$ and $E(e_1, e_3)$.

3.1.4. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \not\subset E(e_1, e_3)$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Let D_1 be a ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 1. By admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, for D_1 with $D_1 \subset L_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, and for D_1 with $D_1 \not\subset L_2$ $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(D_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_1) = v_p(\lambda)$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \geq 2r + 1$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodules $E(e_2, e_3) \cap L_2$ if $s = 2r + 1$ and irreducible if $s > 2r + 1$.

3.2. **The second case of** $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$**.** Assume that

$$[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By admissibility,

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r + s - 1}{3}.$$

Lemma 3.4. *For a* 3×3*-matrix* $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ *and* $P[N] = [N]P$ *if and only if* P *is a lower triangle matrix with* $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2} = P_{3,3}$ *and* $P_{2,1} = 0 = P_{3,1}$.

Proof. The equation $P[N] = [N]P$ forces that P be a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$. Then $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ forces $P_{2,1} = 0 = P_{3,1}$ and $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2} = P_{3,3}$. □

Lemma 3.5. Ee_3, $E(e_1, e_3)$, *and* $E(e_2, e_3)$ *are the only nontrivial proper* ϕ*- and* N*-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.8, we know that Ee_1, Ee_3, $E(e_1, e_3)$, and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are the only nontrivial proper ϕ-invariant subspaces. Now it is easy to check which ones are N-invariant. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case.

3.2.1. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$.

3.2.2. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$. Then, by admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$.

3.2.3. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_1, e_3)$. Then, by admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$.

3.2.4. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_1, e_3)$ and $e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \leq 2r - 2$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $s = 2r - 2$ and irreducible if $s < 2r - 2$.

3.2.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_3)$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$ and $e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \leq 2r + 1$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $s = 2r + 1$ and irreducible if $s < 2r + 1$.

3.2.6. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then, by admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \geq 2r + 1$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $s = 2r + 1$ and irreducible if $s > 2r + 1$.

3.2.7. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces, and $e_3 \notin L_2$. Then, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq 2v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $r + 2 \leq 2s$. If $0 < r < s$, then $r + 2 < 2s$, and so there are always admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case and the corresponding representations are irreducible.

3.3. **The third case of** $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$**.** Assume that

$$[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By admissibility,

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r + s - 2}{3}.$$

Lemma 3.6. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ and $P[N] = [N]P$ if and only if P is a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$ and $P_{3,1} = 0 = P_{3,2}$.*

Proof. The equation $P[N] = [N]P$ forces that P be a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$. Then $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ forces $P_{3,1} = 0 = P_{3,2}$. □

Lemma 3.7.
(1) *$E\mathrm{e}_2$ and $E\mathrm{e}_3$ are the only ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 1.*
(2) *For each $(a, b) \in E^2 \backslash \{(0, 0)\}$, $E(a\mathrm{e}_1 + b\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ is the only ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 2.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, we know that the 1-dimensional ϕ-invariant subspaces of D are the subspaces of $E(e_1, e_2)$ and Ee_3 and that the 2-dimensional subspaces are $E(e_1, e_2)$ and $E(ae_1 + be_2, e_3)$ for each $(a, b) \in E^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. Now it is easy to check which ones are N-invariant. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case.

3.3.1. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_2$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)+1$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

3.3.2. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

3.3.3. Assume that L_2 is ϕ- and N-invariant. Then, by admissibility, $r+s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)+1$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

3.3.4. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$ and $e_3 \notin L_2$. Let D_2 be a ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 2. By admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)+1$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, for D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$ $s = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)+1$, and for D_2 with $L_1 \not\subset D_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)+1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s = 2r-1$, and the corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules Ee_2 and D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$.

3.3.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $e_2 \notin L_2$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$. Let D_2 be a ϕ- and N-invariant subspace of dimension 2. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda)+1$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, for D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$ $s = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq= \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)+1$, and for D_2 with $L_1 \not\subset D_2$ $r = \mathrm{t}_H(D_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(D_2) = 2v_p(\lambda)+1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \leq 2r-1$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodules D_2 with $L_1 \subset D_2$ if $s = 2r-1$ and irreducible if $s < 2r-1$.

3.4. **The fourth case of** $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$**.** Assume that

$$[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By admissibility,

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}.$$

Lemma 3.8. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ and $P[N] = [N]P$ if and only if P is a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2} = P_{3,3}$ and $P_{3,1} = 0 = P_{3,2}$.*

Proof. The equation $P[N] = [N]P$ forces that P be a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$. Then $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ forces $P_{3,1} = 0 = P_{3,2}$ and $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2} = P_{3,3}$. ☐

Lemma 3.9. *Ee_2, Ee_3, and $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ are the only nontrivial proper ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.8, we know that Ee_2, Ee_3, $E(e_1, e_2)$ and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are the only nontrivial proper ϕ-invariant subspaces. Now it is easy to check which ones are N-invariant. ☐

We start to collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case.

3.4.1. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_2$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)+1$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

3.4.2. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_1) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_1) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

3.4.3. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$. Then, by admissibility, $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(L_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(L_2) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

3.4.4. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda) + 1$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \leq 2r - 1$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $s = 2r - 1$ and irreducible if $s < 2r - 1$.

3.4.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$, and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda) + 1$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \geq 2r - 1$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule Ee_2 if $s = 2r - 1$ and irreducible if $s > 2r - 1$.

3.4.6. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $e_2 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda) + 1$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $s \geq 2r + 2$. The corresponding representations are non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $s = 2r + 2$ and irreducible if $s > 2r + 2$.

3.4.7. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$, and $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda) + 1$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules occur in this case if and only if $2s \geq r + 1$. If $0 < r < s$, then $r+1 < 2s$ and so there are always admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case and the corresponding representations are irreducible.

3.5. **The fifth case of** rank $N = 1$**.** Assume that

$$[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\lambda \neq \lambda_2 \neq p\lambda$. By admissibility,

$$2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1.$$

Lemma 3.10. *For a* 3×3*-matrix* $P = (P_{i,j})$*,* $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ *and* $P[N] = [N]P$ *if and only if* P *is a diagonal matrix with* $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$*.*

Proof. The equation $P[N] = [N]P$ forces that P be a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$. Then $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ forces that P be a diagonal matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{3,3}$. □

Lemma 3.11. $E\mathrm{e}_2$*,* $E\mathrm{e}_3$*,* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$*, and* $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *are the only nontrivial proper* ϕ*- and* N*-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.10, we know that the only nontrivial proper ϕ-invariant subspaces are Ee_1, Ee_2, Ee_3, $E(e_1, e_2)$, $E(e_2, e_3)$, and $E(e_1, e_3)$. Now it is easy to check which ones are N-invariant among these subspaces. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case.

3.5.1. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$. Then, by admissibility, $r \leq \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$ and $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$.

3.5.2. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_2$ and $L_2 \neq E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which implies $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) = s$. So we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules, but the corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $E(e_1, e_3)$ and Ee_2. Moreover, Ee_3 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are submodules as well if $r = 1$.

3.5.3. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then, by admissibility, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $s \leq \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, which contradicts to $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$.

3.5.4. Assume that L_1 is not ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_2 = E(e_1, e_3)$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which implies $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) = 0$. So we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules, but the corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $E(e_1, e_3)$ and Ee_2. Moreover, Ee_3 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ are submodules as well if $s = r + 1$.

3.5.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$ and $L_1 \not\subset E(e_1, e_3)$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So, for $\frac{r-1}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq r - 1$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$, we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodules Ee_3, $E(e_2, e_3)$, and $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $r = 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ and if $r > 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = r - 1$ and if $r > 1$, and
- irreducible if $\frac{r-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < r - 1$ and $r > 1$.

3.5.6. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_3)$, and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$ and $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$. By admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which implies $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s-1}{2}$ and $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$. So we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules, but the corresponding representations are decomposable with submodules $E(e_1, e_3)$ and Ee_2.

3.5.7. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, $L_1 \subset E(e_1, e_3)$, and $e_2 \notin L_2$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$ and $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$. By admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So, for $\frac{s-1}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$, we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s-1}{2}$,

- non-split reducible with submodules Ee_2 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and if $s = r + 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule Ee_2 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and if $s > r + 1$, and
- irreducible if $\frac{s-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s-1}{2}$.

3.5.8. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces, and $e_2 \in L_2$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \le \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \le \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \le \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \le \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So, for $\frac{r-1}{2} \le v_p(\lambda) \le \frac{s-1}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$, we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodules $E(e_1, e_3)$ and Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ and if $r = 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ and if $r > 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule Ee_2 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s-1}{2}$, and
- irreducible if $\frac{r-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{s-1}{2}$.

3.5.9. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces, and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $e_2 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \le \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \le \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \le \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \le \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So, for $r \le v_p(\lambda) \le \frac{r+s-1}{2}$, $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$, and $s \ge r + 1$, we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodules Ee_2, Ee_3, and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $s = r + 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $v_p(\lambda) = r$ and if $s > r + 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule Ee_2 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and if $s > r + 1$, and
- irreducible if $r < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and if $s > r + 1$.

3.5.10. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, L_1 is not contained in any ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces, and $e_2, e_3 \notin L_2$. Then, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_2) \le \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_2) = v_p(\lambda_2)$, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \le \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \le \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2)$, and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_1, e_3)) \le \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_1, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. So, for $\frac{r-1}{2} \le v_p(\lambda) \le \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$, we have admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodules Ee_3 and $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ and if $r = 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_1, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ and if $r > 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodules Ee_2 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and if $s = r + 1$,
- non-split reducible with submodule Ee_2 if $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ and if $s > r + 1$, and
- irreducible if $\frac{r-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s-1}{2}$.

3.6. **List of the isomorphism classes with** $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$**.** In the previous subsections, we found all of the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ for $0 < r < s$ with $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$. In this subsection, we classify the isomorphism classes of the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules on $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$.

The following example arises from 3.1.3.

Example 3.12. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1} = D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3, e_2)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$, and $s = 2r + 1$.

Proposition 3.13. (1) *$D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_2$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$.*

(3) *$D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.1.3, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = (e_1 + ae_3, e_2 + be_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - be_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. Notice that this change of a basis does not change the matrix presentation of ϕ by Lemma 3.2. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.1.3.

For the part (3), assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ to $D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$. Clearly, $\lambda = \lambda'$, and, by Lemma 3.2, $[T]$ is a lower triangle matrix such that $T_{1,1} = T_{3,3}$ and $T_{2,1} = T_{3,1} = 0$. Since T preserves the filtration, $[T]$ should be a diagonal matrix with $T_{1,1} = T_{3,3}$, which implies that $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$. The converse is clear. □

The following example arises from 3.1.4.

Example 3.14. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1} = D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, [\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2]);$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_2, \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_2)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $[\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2] \in \mathbb{P}^1(E)$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$, and $s \geq 2r + 1$.

Proposition 3.15. (1) *$D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathfrak{L}_1\mathrm{e}_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2\mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2r + 1$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s > 2r + 1$.*

(3) *$D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, [\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2])$ is isomorphic to $D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', [\mathfrak{L}'_1 : \mathfrak{L}'_2])$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $[\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2] = [\mathfrak{L}'_1 : \mathfrak{L}'_2]$.*

Proof. From 3.1.4, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, ce_2 + de_3)$ with $a \neq 0$ and $[c, d] \in \mathbb{P}^1(E)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$,

$ae_2 \mapsto e_2 - be_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^2_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. Now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.1.4. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.13. ☐

The following example arises from 3.2.4.

Example 3.16. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1} = D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D = E(e_2, e_1 + \mathfrak{L} e_3)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D = E e_2$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$, and $s \leq 2r - 2$.

Proposition 3.17. (1) *$D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ are*
   - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2r - 2$ and*
   - *irreducible if $s < 2r - 2$.*

(3) *$D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.2.4 if we let $L_1 = E(e_2 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_2 + ae_3, e_1 + be_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - ae_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.2.4.

For the part (3), assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ to $D^3_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$. Clearly, $\lambda = \lambda'$, and, by lemma 3.4, $[T]$ is a lower triangle matrix such that $T_{1,1} = T_{2,2} = T_{3,3}$ and $T_{2,1} = T_{3,1} = 0$. Since T preserves the filtration, $[T]$ should be a scalar multiple of the identity, which implies $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$. The converse is clear. ☐

The following example arises from 3.2.5.

Example 3.18. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1} = D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L} e_3, e_2)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L} e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$, and $s \leq 2r + 1$.

Proposition 3.19. (1) *$D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ are*
   - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2r + 1$ and*
   - *irreducible if $s < 2r + 1$.*

(3) *$D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.2.5, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_3, e_2 + be_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - be_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^4_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.2.5. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.17. ☐

The following example arises from 3.2.6.

Example 3.20. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_2, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_2)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E^\times$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$, and $s \geq 2r + 1$.

Proposition 3.21. (1) *$D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ are*
   - *non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $s = 2r + 1$ and*
   - *irreducible if $s > 2r + 1$.*

(3) *$D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.2.6, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ with $a \neq 0$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - \frac{b}{a}e_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^5_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.2.6. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.17. ☐

The following example arises from 3.2.7.

Example 3.22. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2, e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}_1 \in E^\times$, $\mathfrak{L}_2 \in E$, and $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{3}$.

Proposition 3.23. (1) *$D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ are irreducible.*

(3) *$D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2)$ is isomorphic to $D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}_1', \mathfrak{L}_2')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}_1'$, and $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}_2'$.*

Proof. From 3.2.7, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ with $a \neq 0$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2 + ce_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2 - \frac{b}{a}e_3$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^6_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.2.7. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.17. ☐

The following example arises from 3.3.4.

Example 3.24. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^7_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^7_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.

- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$, and $s = 2r-1$.

Proposition 3.25. (1) *$D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ are decomposable with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_2$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$.*

(3) *$D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.3.4, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.3.4.

For the part (3), assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ to $D^7_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$. Clearly, $\lambda = \lambda'$, and, by lemma 3.6, $[T]$ is a lower triangle matrix such that $T_{1,1} = T_{3,3}$ and $T_{3,1} = T_{3,2} = 0$. Since T preserves the filtration, $[T]$ should be a diagonal matrix with $T_{1,1} = T_{3,3}$, which implies $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$. The converse is clear. □

The following example arises from 3.3.5.

Example 3.26. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1} = D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, [\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2]);$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_2 + e_3)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D = E(\mathfrak{L}_1 e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_2(e_2 + e_3))$
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $[\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2] \in \mathbb{P}^1(E)$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$, and $s \leq 2r-1$.

Proposition 3.27. (1) *$D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^8_{rank N=1}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathfrak{L}_1\mathrm{e}_1 + \mathfrak{L}_2\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2r-1$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s < 2r-1$.*

(3) *$D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, [\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2])$ is isomorphic to $D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda', [\mathfrak{L}'_1 : \mathfrak{L}'_2])$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $[\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2] = [\mathfrak{L}'_1 : \mathfrak{L}'_2]$.*

Proof. From 3.3.5, we may let either $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ or $L_1 = E(e_2 + ce_3)$ with $c \neq 0$. If $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$, then we may let $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2 + de_3)$ with $d \neq 0$ and so, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 + (b - ad)e_2$, $e_2 \mapsto de_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ for $[\mathfrak{L}_1 : \mathfrak{L}_2] \neq [0 : 1]$. If $L_1 = E(e_2 + ce_3)$ with $c \neq 0$, then we may let $L_2 = E(e_2 + ce_3, e_1 + fe_3)$, and so, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 + fe_2$, $e_2 \mapsto ce_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get the other part of $D^8_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.3.5. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.25 □

The following example arises from 3.4.4.

Example 3.28. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^9_{\operatorname{rank} N=1} = D^9_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_2 + \mathfrak{L}e_3, e_1)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_2 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E^\times$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$, and $s \leq 2r - 1$.

Proposition 3.29. (1) *$D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\mathrm{rank}\, N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2r - 1$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s < 2r - 1$.*

(3) *$D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.4.4, if we let $L_1 = E(e_2 + ae_3)$ with $a \neq 0$ and $L_2 = E(e_2 + ae_3, e_1 + be_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 + \frac{b}{a}e_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.4.4.

For the part (3), assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ to $D^9_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$. Then $\lambda = \lambda'$ and, by Lemma 3.8, $[T]$ is a lower triangle matrix with $T_{1,1} = T_{2,2} = T_{3,3}$ and $T_{3,1} = 0 = T_{3,2}$. Since T preserves the filtration, it should be a scalar multiple of the identity, which implies that $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$. The converse is trivial. □

The following example arises from 3.4.5.

Example 3.30. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$, and $s \geq 2r - 1$.

Proposition 3.31. (1) *$D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\mathrm{rank}\, N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_2$ if $s = 2r - 1$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s > 2r - 1$.*

(3) *$D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.4.5, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.4.5. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.29. □

The following example arises from 3.4.6.

Example 3.32. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.

- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$, and $s \geq 2r+2$.

Proposition 3.33. *(1) $D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* rank $N = 1$.

(2) The corresponding representations to $D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$ are
   - *non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $s = 2r+2$ and*
   - *irreducible if $s > 2r+2$.*

(3) $D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.

Proof. From 3.4.6, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_3)$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{11}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) immediate from 3.4.6. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.29. ☐

The following example arises from 3.4.7.

Example 3.34. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{12}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1} = D^{12}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_3, e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}_1 \in E$, $\mathfrak{L}_2 \in E^\times$, and $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-2}{3}$.

Proposition 3.35. *(1) $D^{12}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* rank $N = 1$.

(2) The corresponding representations to $D^{12}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$ are irreducible.

(3) $D^{12}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2)$ is isomorphic to $D^{10}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}_1', \mathfrak{L}_2')$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}_1'$, and $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}_2'$.

Proof. From 3.4.7, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2 + ce_3)$ with $c \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1 - ae_2$, $e_2 \mapsto e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{12}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.4.7. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.29. ☐

The following example arises from 3.5.2.

Example 3.36. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{13}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1} = D^{13}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_2, e_1 + \mathfrak{L} e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = Ee_2$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_2 \neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$, and $v_p(\lambda_2) = s$.

Proposition 3.37. *(1) $D^{13}_{\mathrm{rank}\, N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* rank $N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to* $D^{13}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ *are decomposable with submodules* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$*; moreover,* $E\mathrm{e}_3$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$ *are submodules as well if* $r=1$*.*

(3) $D^{13}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L})$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{13}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda',\lambda_2',\mathfrak{L}')$ *if and only if* $\lambda=\lambda'$*,* $\lambda_2=\lambda_2'$*, and* $\mathfrak{L}=\mathfrak{L}'$*.*

Proof. From 3.5.2, if we let $L_1=Ee_2$ and $L_2=E(e_2,e_1+ae_3)$, then we get $D^{13}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.2.

For the part (3), assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^{13}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L})$ to $D^{13}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda',\lambda_2',\mathfrak{L})$. Then $\lambda=\lambda'$, $\lambda_2=\lambda_2'$, and, by Lemma 3.10, $[T]$ is a diagonal matrix with $T_{1,1}=T_{3,3}$. Since T preserves the filtration, it should be a scalar multiple of the identity, which implies that $\mathfrak{L}=\mathfrak{L}'$. The converse is trivial. □

The following example arises from 3.5.4.

Example 3.38. A filtered (ϕ,N)-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}=D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L});$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D=E(e_1,e_3)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+\mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N]=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0\\0&0&0\\1&0&0\end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}p\lambda&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda\end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda\neq\lambda_2\neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}\in E$, $v_p(\lambda)=\frac{r+s-1}{2}$, and $v_p(\lambda_2)=0$.

Proposition 3.39. (1) $D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ *represents admissible filtered* (ϕ,N)*-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N=1$*.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* $D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ *are decomposable with submodules* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$*; moreover,* $E\mathrm{e}_3$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$ *are submodules as well if* $s=r+1$*.*

(3) $D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L})$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda',\lambda_2',\mathfrak{L}')$ *if and only if* $\lambda=\lambda'$*,* $\lambda_2=\lambda_2'$*, and* $\mathfrak{L}=\mathfrak{L}'$*.*

Proof. From 3.5.4, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_1,e_3)$, then we get $D^{14}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.4. For the part (3), use the same argument in Proposition 3.37. □

The following example arises from 3.5.5.

Example 3.40. A filtered (ϕ,N)-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{15}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}=D^{15}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L});$$

- $\operatorname{Fil}^r D=E(e_2+e_3,e_1+\mathfrak{L}e_3)$ and $\operatorname{Fil}^s D=E(e_2+e_3)$.
- $[N]=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0\\0&0&0\\1&0&0\end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}p\lambda&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda\end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda\neq\lambda_2\neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}\in E$, $\frac{r-1}{2}\leq v_p(\lambda)\leq r-1$, and $2v_p(\lambda)+v_p(\lambda_2)=r+s-1$.

Proposition 3.41. (1) $D^{15}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ *represents admissible filtered* (ϕ,N)*-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N=1$*.*

(2) *The corresponding representations to* $D^{15}_{\operatorname{rank} N=1}$ *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodules* $E\mathrm{e}_3$*,* $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$*, and* $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $r=1$*,*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda)=\frac{r-1}{2}$ *and* $r>1$*,*

  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = r-1$ *and* $r > 1$, *and*
  - *irreducible if* $\frac{r-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < r-1$ *and* $r > 1$.

(3) $D^{15}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L})$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{15}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \lambda'_2, \mathfrak{L}')$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, *and* $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.

Proof. From 3.5.5, if we let $L_1 = E(e_2 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_2 + ae_3, e_1 + be_3)$ with $a \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto ae_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{15}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.5. For the part (3), use the same argument in Proposition 3.37. □

The following example arises from 3.5.6.

Example 3.42. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3, e_2)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_2 \neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s-1}{2}$, and $v_p(\lambda_2) = r$.

Proposition 3.43. (1) $D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *represents admissible filtered* (ϕ, N)*-modules with* rank $N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to* $D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *are decomposable with submodules* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$.

(3) $D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L})$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \lambda'_2, \mathfrak{L}')$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, *and* $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.

Proof. From 3.5.6, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_3, e_2)$, then we get $D^{16}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.6. For the part (3), use the same argument in Proposition 3.37. □

The following example arises from 3.5.7.

Example 3.44. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{17}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^{17}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L});$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3, e_2 + e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_2 \neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L} \in E$, $\frac{s-1}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s-1}{2}$, and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$.

Proposition 3.45. (1) $D^{17}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *represents admissible filtered* (ϕ, N)*-modules with* rank $N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to* $D^{17}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodules* $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{s-1}{2}$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ *and* $s = r + 1$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ *and* $s > r+1$, *and*
  - *irreducible if* $\frac{s-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s-1}{2}$.

(3) *$D^{17}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^{17}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda',\lambda'_2,\mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda=\lambda'$, $\lambda_2=\lambda'_2$, and $\mathfrak{L}=\mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.5.7, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_1+ae_3,e_2+be_3)$ with $b\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $e_2\mapsto be_2$, and $e_3\mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{17}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.7. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.37. □

The following example arises from 3.5.8.

Example 3.46. A filtered (ϕ,N)-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}=D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L});$$

- $\text{Fil}^r D=E(e_1+\mathfrak{L}e_3,e_2)$ and $\text{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+e_2+\mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N]=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0\\0&0&0\\1&0&0\end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}p\lambda&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda\end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda\neq\lambda_2\neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}\in E$, $\frac{r-1}{2}\le v_p(\lambda)\le\frac{s-1}{2}$, and $2v_p(\lambda)+v_p(\lambda_2)=r+s-1$.

Proposition 3.47. (1) *$D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ,N)-modules with* rank $N=1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}$ are*
- *non-split reducible with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda)=\frac{r-1}{2}$ and $r=1$,*
- *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_1,\mathrm{e}_3)$ if $v_p(\lambda)=\frac{r-1}{2}$ and $r>1$,*
- *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_2$ if $v_p(\lambda)=\frac{s-1}{2}$, and*
- *irreducible if $\frac{r-1}{2}<v_p(\lambda)<\frac{s-1}{2}$.*

(3) *$D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L})$ is isomorphic to $D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda',\lambda'_2,\mathfrak{L}')$ if and only if $\lambda=\lambda'$, $\lambda_2=\lambda'_2$, and $\mathfrak{L}=\mathfrak{L}'$.*

Proof. From 3.5.8, if we let $L_1=E(e_1+ae_2+be_3)$ and $L_2=E(e_1+ae_2+be_3,e_2)$ with $a\neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1\mapsto e_1$, $e_2\mapsto\frac{1}{a}e_2$, and $e_3\mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{18}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.8. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.37. □

The following example arises from 3.5.9.

Example 3.48. A filtered (ϕ,N)-module of Hodge type $(0,r,s)$

$$D^{19}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}=D^{19}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\mathfrak{L});$$

- $\text{Fil}^r D=E(e_1+e_2,e_3)$ and $\text{Fil}^s D=E(e_1+e_2+\mathfrak{L}e_3)$.
- $[N]=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0\\0&0&0\\1&0&0\end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi]=\begin{pmatrix}p\lambda&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda\end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda\neq\lambda_2\neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}\in E$, $r\le v_p(\lambda)\le\frac{r+s-1}{2}$, $2v_p(\lambda)+v_p(\lambda_2)=r+s-1$, and $s\ge r+1$.

Proposition 3.49. (1) *$D^{19}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ,N)-modules with* rank $N=1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^{19}_{\text{rank}\,N=1}$ are*
- *non-split reducible with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_2$, $E\mathrm{e}_3$, and $E(\mathrm{e}_2,\mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s=r+1$,*
- *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $v_p(\lambda)=r$ and $s>r+1$,*

  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ *and* $s > r+1$, *and*
  - *irreducible if* $r < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ *and* $s > r+1$.

(3) $D^{19}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L})$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{19}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \lambda'_2, \mathfrak{L}')$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, *and* $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}'$.

Proof. From 3.5.9, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_3)$ with $a \neq 0$, then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{a}e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{19}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.9. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.37. □

The following example arises from 3.5.10.

Example 3.50. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1} = D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_3, e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \neq \lambda_2 \neq p\lambda$ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}_1 \in E$, $\mathfrak{L}_2 \in E^\times$, $\frac{r-1}{2} \leq v_p(\lambda) \leq \frac{r+s-1}{2}$, and $2v_p(\lambda) + v_p(\lambda_2) = r + s - 1$.

Proposition 3.51. (1) $D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *represents admissible filtered* (ϕ, N)*-modules with* $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 1$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to* $D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodules* $E\mathrm{e}_3$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ *and* $r = 1$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E(\mathrm{e}_1, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r-1}{2}$ *and* $r > 1$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *and* $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ *and* $s = r+1$,
  - *non-split reducible with submodule* $E\mathrm{e}_2$ *if* $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-1}{2}$ *and* $s > r+1$, *and*
  - *irreducible if* $\frac{r-1}{2} < v_p(\lambda) < \frac{r+s-1}{2}$.

(3) $D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda, \lambda_2, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2)$ *is isomorphic to* $D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}(\lambda', \lambda'_2, \mathfrak{L}'_1, \mathfrak{L}'_2)$ *if and only if* $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda'_2$, $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}'_1$, *and* $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}'_2$.

Proof. From 3.5.10, if we let $L_1 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3)$ and $L_2 = E(e_1 + ae_2 + be_3, e_2 + ce_3)$ with $ca \neq 0$ then, by change of a basis: $e_1 \mapsto e_1$, $e_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{a}e_2$, and $e_3 \mapsto e_3$, we get $D^{20}_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. So now the part (1) and (2) are immediate from 3.5.10. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 3.37. □

Proposition 3.52. *Every semi-stable representation of* $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ *with regular Hodge–Tate weights and with* $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 1$ *is isomorphic to a representation corresponding to some* $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *up to twist by a power of the cyclotomic character.*

Proof. We found all the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 1$ in the previous subsections. Since the list of filtered modules in this subsection represents all of the modules in the previous subsections, we are done. □

Proposition 3.53. *Let* $i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., 20\}$. *If* $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ *is isomorphic to* $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$, *then* $i = j$.

Proof. Since an isomorphism preserves the Jordan forms of the Frobenius map, if $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ is isomorphic to $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$, then both i and j belong to either $\{1,2\}$, $[3,6]$, $\{7,8\}$, $[9,12]$, or $[13,20]$.

$D^1_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ is not isomorphic to $D^2_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$, since any invertible linear map of the form in Lemma 3.2 can not preserve $\mathrm{Fil}^s D$. Likewise, $D^7_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ is not isomorphic to $D^8_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$, since any invertible linear map of the form in Lemma 3.6 can not preserve the filtration.

Let $i \neq j \in [3,6]$. Then $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ is not isomorphic to $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$, since any invertible linear map of the form in Lemma 3.4 can not preserve the filtration. Likewise, for any $i \neq j \in [9,12]$, $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ is not isomorphic to $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$, since any invertible linear map of the form in Lemma 3.8 can not preserve the filtration.

Let $i \neq j \in [13,20]$. By the same argument, any invertible linear map of the form in Lemma 3.10 can not preserve the filtration of $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ to the one of $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. Hence, if $i \neq j$ there are no isomorphism between $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$ and $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=1}$. □

4. ADMISSIBLE FILTERED (ϕ, N)-MODULES WITH $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 2$

In this section, we classify the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ for $0 < r < s$ and with the monodromy operator N of rank 2. We follow exactly the same argument in the previous section. Assume first that N has rank 2. By choice of a basis for $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$, we may set

$$N e_1 = e_2,\ N e_2 = e_3,\ \text{and } N e_3 = 0.$$

From the equation $N\phi = p\phi N$, we should have that

$$\phi e_1 = p^2 x e_1 + p y e_2 + z e_3,\ \ \phi e_2 = p x e_2 + y e_3,\ \text{and } \phi e_3 = x e_3,$$

for some y, z, and $x \neq 0$. By change of a basis, we can say a bit more.

Lemma 4.1. *There is an invertible matrix P such that*

$$P[N]P^{-1} = [N] \textit{ and } P[\phi]P^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} p^2 x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & px & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Use the matrix $P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{y}{x(1-p)} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{py^2 + zx(1-p)}{x^2(1-p)(1-p^2)} & \frac{y}{x(1-p)} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. □

In this section, we assume

$$[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p^2\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } [N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By admissibility, we have

$$v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r + s - 3}{3}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *For a 3×3-matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$, $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ and $P[N] = [N]P$ if and only if P is a scalar multiple of the identity.*

Proof. The equation $P[N] = [N]P$ forces that P be a lower triangle matrix with $P_{1,1} = P_{2,2} = P_{3,3}$ and with $P_{2,1} = P_{3,2}$. Then $P[\phi] = [\phi]P$ forces that P be a scalar multiple of the identity. □

4.1. **The only case of** $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$**.** In this subsection, we collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$.

Lemma 4.3. *$E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ are the only nontrivial proper ϕ- and N-invariant subspaces.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.10, we know that the only nontrivial proper ϕ-invariant subspaces of D are Ee_1, Ee_2, Ee_3, $E(e_1, e_2)$, $E(e_2, e_3)$, and $E(e_1, e_3)$. Now it is easy to check which ones are N-invariant among these subspaces. □

We start to collect the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules in this case.

4.1.1. Assume that $L_1 = Ee_3$. Then, by admissibility, we have $s = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$, which contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-3}{3}$.

4.1.2. Assume that $L_2 = E(e_2, e_3)$. Then, by admissibility, we have $r + s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$, which also contradicts to $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-3}{3}$.

4.1.3. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $L_1 \subset E(e_2, e_3)$. Then $e_3 \notin L_2$ and, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $s = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. Hence, there exist admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules if and only if $s \leq 2r - 3$. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodule $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $s = 2r - 3$, and
- irreducible if $s < 2r - 3$.

4.1.4. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant and $e_3 \in L_2$. Then $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$ and, by admissibility, $r = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. Hence, there exist admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules if and only if $s \geq 2r + 3$. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodule Ee_3 if $s = 2r + 3$, and
- irreducible if $s > 2r + 3$.

4.1.5. Assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are ϕ- and N-invariant, $L_1 \not\subset E(e_2, e_3)$, and $e_3 \notin L_2$. Then, by admissibility, $0 = \mathrm{t}_H(Ee_3) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(Ee_3) = v_p(\lambda)$ and $r = \mathrm{t}_H(E(e_2, e_3)) \leq \mathrm{t}_N(E(e_2, e_3)) = 2v_p(\lambda) + 1$. Hence, there exist admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules if and only if $2s \geq r + 3$. The corresponding representations are

- non-split reducible with submodules Ee_3 and $E(e_2, e_3)$ if $2s = r + 3$, or equivalently, if $r = 1$ and $s = 2$, and
- irreducible if $2s > r + 3$, or equivalently, if $s > 2$.

4.2. **List of the isomorphism classes with** $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$**.** In the previous subsection, we found all of the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$ for $0 < r < s$ with $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$. In this subsection, we classify the isomorphism classes of the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules on $D = E(e_1, e_2, e_3)$.

The following example arises from 4.1.3.

Example 4.4. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=2} = D^1_{\operatorname{rank} N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_3, e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p^2\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.

- $\mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2 \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-3}{3}$, and $s \leq 2r-3$.

Proposition 4.5. *(1) $D^1_{\text{rank}\,N=2}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^1_{\text{rank}\,N=2}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2r-3$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s < 2r-3$.*

(3) *$D^1_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2)$ is isomorphic to $D^1_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}'_1, \mathfrak{L}'_2)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}'_1$, and $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}'_2$.*

Proof. The part (1) and (2) are immediate from 4.1.3. For the part (3), assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^1_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2)$ to $D^1_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}'_1, \mathfrak{L}'_2)$. Clearly, $\lambda = \lambda'$, and we know that T is a scalar multiple of the identity by lemma 4.2. Since T preserves the filtration, it is easy to check that $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}'_1$ and $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}'_2$. The converse is clear. ☐

The following example arises from 4.1.4.

Example 4.6. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^2_{\text{rank}\,N=2} = D^2_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3, e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p^2\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2 \in E$, $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-3}{3}$, and $s \geq 2r+3$.

Proposition 4.7. *(1) $D^2_{\text{rank}\,N=2}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^2_{\text{rank}\,N=2}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodule $E\mathrm{e}_3$ if $s = 2r+3$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s > 2r+3$.*

(3) *$D^2_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2)$ is isomorphic to $D^2_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}'_1, \mathfrak{L}'_2)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}'_1$, and $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}'_2$.*

Proof. The part (1) and (2) are immediate from 4.1.4. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 4.5. ☐

The following example arises from 4.1.5.

Example 4.8. A filtered (ϕ, N)-module of Hodge type $(0, r, s)$

$$D^3_{\text{rank}\,N=2} = D^3_{\text{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2, \mathfrak{L}_3);$$

- $\mathrm{Fil}^r D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3, e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_3 e_3)$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^s D = E(e_1 + \mathfrak{L}_1 e_2 + \mathfrak{L}_2 e_3)$.
- $[N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} p^2\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for λ in E.
- $\mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2, \mathfrak{L}_3 \in E$ and $v_p(\lambda) = \frac{r+s-3}{3}$.

Proposition 4.9. *(1) $D^3_{\text{rank}\,N=2}$ represents admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with* $\operatorname{rank} N = 2$.

(2) *The corresponding representations to $D^3_{\text{rank}\,N=2}$ are*
  - *non-split reducible with submodules $E\mathrm{e}_3$ and $E(\mathrm{e}_2, \mathrm{e}_3)$ if $s = 2$ and*
  - *irreducible if $s > 2$.*

(3) *$D^3_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2, \mathfrak{L}_3)$ is isomorphic to $D^3_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}(\lambda', \mathfrak{L}'_1, \mathfrak{L}'_2, \mathfrak{L}'_3)$ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$, $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathfrak{L}'_1$, $\mathfrak{L}_2 = \mathfrak{L}'_2$, and $\mathfrak{L}_3 = \mathfrak{L}'_3$.*

Proof. The part (1) and (2) are immediate from 4.1.5. For the part (3), use the same argument as in Proposition 4.5. ☐

Remark 4.10. According to $D^1_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$, $D^2_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$, and $D^3_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$, there are no irreducible admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules of Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1, 2)$ and with $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 2$. But this is not a surprising result. For the 2-dimensional case, there are no irreducible, semi-stable, non-crystalline representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1)$.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. If $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$ is isomorphic to $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$, then $i = j$.*

Proof. $D^1_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$ is not isomorphic to $D^2_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$, since $D^1_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$ is defined for $s \leq 2r - 4$ and $D^2_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$ for $s \geq 2r + 4$. For the other pairs, assume that T is an isomorphism from $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$ to $D^j_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$. For each k, we let φ_k be the Frobenius map for $D^k_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$. Then obviously $\phi_i = \phi_j$. By Lemma 4.2, we know that T is a scalar multiple of the identity. However, for each pair (i, j) with $i \neq j$, it is easy to check that any scalar multiple of the identity can not preserve the filtration. ☐

Proposition 4.12. *Every 3-dimensional semi-stable representation of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with regular Hodge–Tate weights and with $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 2$ is isomorphic to a representation corresponding to some $D^i_{\mathrm{rank}\,N=2}$ up to twist by a power of the cyclotomic character.*

Proof. We found all the admissible filtered (ϕ, N)-modules with $\mathrm{rank}\,N = 2$ in the previous subsection. Since the list of filtered modules in this subsection represents all of the modules in the previous subsection, we are done. ☐

REFERENCES

[1] C. Breuil, *Groupes p-divisibles, groupes finis et modules filtrés*, Ann. of Math. (2) 152 (2000), 489–549.

[2] C. Breuil and A. Mézard, *Multiplicités modulaires et représentations de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ *et de Gal*$(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ *en* $l = p$, With an appendix by Guy Henniart, Duke Math. J. 115 (2002), no. 2, 205-310. MR1944572 (2004i:11052)

[3] C. Breuil, B. Conrad, F. Diamond, R. Taylor, *On the modularity of elliptic curves over* $\mathbb{Q}$*: wild* 3*-adic exercises*, Journal of the A.M.S., 14, 843-939, 2001.

[4] Gerasimos Dousmanis, *Rank two filtered* (ϕ, N)*-modules with Galois descent data and coefficients*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 362, N. 7, July 2010, pp. 3883-3910.

[5] Gerasimos Dousmanis, *Rank* 3 *filtered* (ϕ, N)*-modules*, arXiv:1211.3978, submitted on 16. Nov. 2012.

[6] P. Colmez and J.-M. Fontaine, *Construction des représentations p-adiques semi-stables*, Invent. Math., 140 (2000), 1.43. MR1779803 (2001g:11184)

[7] M. Emerton, T. Gee, *A geometric perspective on the Breuil–Mézard conjecture*, preprint.

[8] J.-M. Fontaine, *Le corps des periodes p-adiques*, Asterisque 223, Soc. Math. de France, 59-111, 1994.

[9] J.-M. Fontaine and B. Mazur, *Geometric Galois representations. Elliptic curves, modular forms, and Fermat's last theorem*, Hong Kong, 1993, 41.78, Ser. Number Theory, I, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995. MR1363495 (96h:11049)

[10] E. Ghate and A. Mézard, *Filtered modules with coefficients*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 361, May 2009, pp. 2243-2261.

[11] M. Kisin, *Potentially semi-stable deformation rings*, Journal of the A.M.S. 21 (2008) no. 2, 513–546.

[12] M. Kisin, *The Fontaine-Mazur conjecture for* GL_2, Journal of the A.M.S. 22 (2009) no. 3, 641–690.

[13] M. Kisin, *Moduli of finite flat group schemes, and modularity*, Ann. of Math. (2) 170 (2009) no. 3, 1085–1180.

[14] D. Savitt, *On a conjecture of Conrad, Diamond, and Taylor*, Duke math. Vol. 128, 2005, N. 1, pp 141-197, MR2137952 (2006c:11060)

[15] R. Taylor, A. Wiles, *Ring theoretic properties of certain Hecke algebras*, Ann. of Math, 141(3), 553-572, 1995.

[16] A Wiles, *Modular elliptic curves and Fermat's last theorem*, Ann. of Math, 141(3), 443-551, 1995.

Department of Mathematics, The University of Arizona
E-mail address: `cpark@math.arizona.edu`